

June 11, 2019

A meeting of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission was held on Tuesday, June 11, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. in Meeting Rooms 4 & 5 of the Hendricks County Government Center, 355 South Washington Street, Danville, Indiana 46122. Members present were Mr. Brad Whicker, President; Mr. Walt O'Riley; Mr. Tim Whicker; Mr. Damon Palmer. Members absent were Mr. Jeff Pell; Mr. Bob Gentry; Mrs. Sonnie Johnston. Staff members present were Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Secretary and Director of Planning; Mr. Greg Steuerwald, County Attorney; Mr. David Gaston, County Surveyor; Mr. John Ayers, County Engineer; Mrs. Suzanne Baker, Senior Planner; and Mrs. Brandy Swinford, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. There were four (4) members present.

Mr. Brad Whicker announced that if anyone was in attendance for the first three (3) petitions, that those were going to be continued in a few moments. He apologized for the inconvenience if the word had not gotten out to the members of the audience.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated the first order of business was approval of the May 14, 2019 meeting minutes.

It was noted that since Mr. O'Riley would need to abstain since he was not in attendance last meeting, that the minutes would not be voted upon. They needed all four (4) members to approve.

The approval of the May 14, 2019 minutes would be continued until the July 9, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Brad Whicker moved on to the public hearing items on the agenda.

**ZA 464/19: REDWOOD ACQUISITIONS;** a zoning amendment change from AGR/Agriculture Residential District to RE/Multi-Family Residential District; 22.05 acres; Lincoln Township; S6-T16-R2; located approximately 600 feet north of the intersection of E. 600 North and N. 900 East on the east side of the road. (Russell A. Brown, Attorney)

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if this was an applicant requested continuance.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that the petitioner requested a continuance in order to address some of the staff's preliminary comments better. They have not sent out their mailings, but we had advertised.

Mr. O'Riley motioned to continue **ZA 464/19: Redwood Acquisitions** until the July 9, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Tim Whicker seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

FOR – 4 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

**MAP 742/18 (PRIMARY): SOUTHGATE;** a 10-lot major estate subdivision; 21.711 acres; Guilford Township; S24-T14N-R1E; located northeast of the intersection of East Hendricks County Road and Indianapolis Road. (Holloway Engineering)

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if this was another request made by the applicant.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that it was. The applicant needed to hold a joint drainage board meeting with Morgan county. Orchestrating that took some time to get everyone in the same room. The meeting has taken place and they are revising their plans based on those comments. They will advertise, and we will hear them at the next meeting.

Mr. Tim Whicker motioned to continue **MAP 742/19 (Primary): Southgate** until the July 9, 2019 meeting.

Mr. O'Riley seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

FOR – 4 –

AGAINST – 0 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

**MAP 743/19 (PRIMARY): GENTRY WOODS (ESTATE SUBDIVISION);** an 11-lot major estate subdivision; 82.32 acres; Center Township; S31-T16N-R1W; located on the southwest quadrant of the intersection of County Roads 200 North and 200 West. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Again, Mr. Brad Whicker asked Mr. Dombrosky if this was an applicant request for a continuance.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they were doing a wetlands study and doing some additional groundwork. They have done that and would be heard at the next meeting.

Mr. Brad Whicker noted that the applicants had requested a meeting with him, and he had met with them today to offer some suggestions and guidance to improve their request.

Mr. O'Riley motioned to continue **MAP 743/19 (Primary): Gentry Woods (Estate Subdivision)** until the July 9, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Palmer seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

FOR – 4 –

AGAINST – 0 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

**DPR 475/19 (PRIMARY): I-70 WEST, LLC – BLDG. 3;** a development plat review for a new warehouse building; 53.98 acres; Liberty Township; S26-T14N-R1W; located at Innovation Boulevard and State Road 39. (Studio A of Indianapolis, Inc.)

Mr. Max Mouser of Studio A Indianapolis, Inc. appeared along with Mr. Jason Windler, Mr. Chad Lindley of Sunbeam Development, and Mr. Paul Myer with GRA Architecture. Mr. Mouser reviewed previous stages of the project. He showed the location of Building 3 in relation to the others. He pointed out the parcels that I-70 West owns currently around the proposed site. This proposed building would be 700,449 square feet on approximately 54 acres, with loading docks on the north and south sides. It would have a shared drive with Building 2. He stated that Innovation Boulevard would be extended and stopped short of County Road 1000. The reason in doing so would be to keep the semi-truck traffic off the road until improvements are made. There would be a new shared drive that would go up to the north and eventually connect to future buildings. A retention pond is proposed for the north side of the building. Along Innovation Boulevard there is a dry basin for the south side of the building. Parking on the west end of the building would all drain into a retention pond on the southwest side. Mr. Mouser then went on to discuss the modifications they requested.

1. Bicycle parking; they are proposing six (6) spaces instead of the 26 required. He stated that there are not usually a lot of bicyclists in a warehouse facility. They also do not know what tenants are going to be utilizing the facility. If future tenants required more spaces, they would add at that time.
2. Perimeter landscaping on the north and south side; they have future plans to develop more to the north and with not knowing the connections to the pond and roadways, it would be difficult. It is industrial to industrial and they have not done landscaping on that in the past. They proposed doing a 3-foot mound along Innovation Boulevard and doing landscaping on it. They are requesting a variance for both the north and south side.
3. Buffer yard to the west; there is an existing tree row approximately 45-feet deep. The buffer yard requirement is 30-feet deep. They are proposing to leave those existing trees and then grade from the tree line up to the road which is approximately a 4-foot incline. Within that area at about 15-20 feet, they are proposing to add a row of evergreens every 50 feet to compensate for the lack of evergreens in the existing tree line.

4. Waste container; they are proposing to wait until the tenant(s) are established first. They are also requesting the modification for screening since they would not know where the tenants want the waste container, they would not know screening at this time. Typically, in this type of facility, there is not a waste container but a compactor that would be located near the loading docks.

Mr. Mouser then moved on to discuss the building modifications. He stated the offset projection ordinance requires a 2-foot projection on anything longer than 90 feet. In a warehouse, you have the speed bay which is the outer bay where fork trucks are driving to unload and load. It becomes a safety hazard to those drivers with those projections. It is typically seen in a commercial project, not in warehouses. It is also more cost effective to not have them, as it is wasted space in this type of setting. They have proposed to use color variations every 60 feet which give the look of a broken-up façade. On the southeast and southwest corners there will be a 4-foot bump. The next modification is the fifty (50) percent masonry requirement. It is not practical to do with a warehouse building. They are proposing the use of color variation on the bottom half of the building to break up the look. The final modification is for the roof mounted equipment. They have taken line of sight views from four places around the building, primarily the corners. The line of sight is taken from approximately 4 feet, the height as if you were riding in a car looking up to the roof where equipment could be located. There are no units proposed for the building at this time, but they are showing what it could look like. The building sits on the high point of Innovation Boulevard so it should be screened.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked for further questions from the plan commission members. There being no questions, he opened the public hearing.

Mr. Larry Wineman, 9583 S. County Road 100 E. appeared. He stated that the existing trees are not enough. He presented pictures of the trees from his property. The pictures show broken tree limbs, dead trees, shrubs, weeds as well as living trees. He stated that you can see the other warehouses. He would like to see a higher mound. In the fall, you can see all the lights from the warehouse parking lots. He stated that the creek was small enough to step across.

Ms. Jennifer Welch, 9557 S. County Road 100 E. appeared. She stated that once they move that much land and change the drainage, it would have a serious effect on the existing trees. There are large gaps of bare areas within the existing tree line. She is concerned about the traffic from semi-trucks on the county roads. She stated that they were minor roads and never intended for heavy use. She feels that the added traffic would be a safety concern for the children who play along these roads, joggers like herself, and animals who cross as well. She believed that the proposed parking lot and shared drive would create more noise pollution for the homeowners due to around the clock shifts. She stated that she can already hear backup alarms and vehicles from the existing warehouse 100 yards away. She stated that the additional lighting from headlights, building, and parking lots would cause issues with the residential zoning. She stated that she believed the proposed parking lot on the west side could be flipped to be between the existing warehouse and the new building. The around the clock worker traffic is also a safety concern for the residents. She also stated her concern about the drainage from the proposed parking lot into the creek and then onto other residents' properties. She stated that hers and other residents back lot remains wet for much of the year and that this could possibly make that worse. She requested a drainage study be done to see the impact of how disturbing this much farmland would push more drainage onto their properties. She noted that the proposed building is on the high point so the drainage would be to the east and west. She stated that there is minimal existing storm water drainage on Innovation Boulevard. She believed that the parking lot and shared drive would negatively affect the property values of the homeowners. She stated that the proposed barrier of 50-foot spacing of evergreens on the 3-foot berm is not adequate like they have already built along County Road 1000. The trees there are deciduous and that leaves them with no coverage for 6 months out of the year. Herself

and many others have livestock along the back property line. She is concerned for the safety of the animals. The plans are unclear to her what the berm would look like if the evergreens were planted on level ground. The zoning approval calls for extensive screening and she would like to see that in greater detail on the plans.

Mr. John Allen, 9825 S. County Road 100 E. appeared. He stated his property is near where the proposed retention pond will be located. He thanked the board members for their service, and he hoped that they would study upon the concerns brought up tonight. He stated that he believed that the variance should be on the side of the residents, and not the developers.

Mr. Greg Fernande, 9641 S. County Road 100 E. appeared. He stated that they had moved there in August of 2018. He stated that once Fall came the existing warehouse appeared to be much closer than before with the loss of the foliage. The lights and noise from the warehouse and semi-truck traffic was much more noticeable. When he received the letter regarding the new warehouse, it raised some concerns. He presented a petition with approximately 37 signatures from residents who are opposing the proposed elimination of the required 3-foot mound on the west side. The residents would like to see a higher mound than that due to the lights and sounds from the proposed new warehouse. He stated that he believed it would hurt property value. He stated from the existing warehouse looking towards the homes you cannot see anything, but that from the homes looking east, you can see nothing but the warehouse. He also presented pictures from his property showing how close the existing warehouse is. Also included were photos of existing mounds along Innovation Boulevard and State Road 39 as examples of what they would like to see.

Ms. Rachele Baker, 9675 S. County Road 100 E. appeared. She stated she expected to see proposed contours, berms on the plans to give a better idea of what the visual barrier would look like. She would like to see that when it is available. She brought up the screening of the roof mounted equipment. She thought it was to screen it from adjacent landowners, but it appears that it would only screen from up close to the building. She stated that she has a two-story building so that it would a direct line to the top of the warehouse. She would like to see the screening put in place. She stated that the majority of the existing trees they want to use for screening are on their side of the ditch. She believed that the landscaping requirements should stay on the petitioner's side, not be pushed onto their properties. She stated the trees that were there currently are Ash, Hawthorne and Locust along with some honeysuckle. Those are not good as they do not provide enough screening due to their size and fullness. She noted that the amount of light coming from the existing warehouses now in the wintertime is extreme. It would only be worse with another warehouse so close. She then brought up the increased traffic another warehouse would bring. Traffic is already bad in that area due to the existing warehouses and she thought that it needed to be looked at. She agreed with the idea of moving the parking lot to be between the buildings. She stated it would block workers from mischief on their property.

Mr. Brad Whicker then asked Mr. Ayers to comment on the scheduled improvements to that intersection.

Mr. Ayers stated that the state is going to be doing substantial improvements. It was going to be a one- or two-year project. They are working with the developers to minimize the affect to those as it comes to State Road 39.

Ms. Baker asked if the improvements proposed would include the intersection at County Road 1000 South.

Mr. Ayers stated that as of right now, it stops just short of that intersection.

Ms. Ginger Marshall, 9675 S. County Road 100 E. appeared. She stated that she, as well as others in the area, have small children so safety is a concern as mentioned before. She stated that most of her concerns had already been addressed by the other homeowners.

Mr. Brad Whicker closed the public hearing after hearing from all those signed up to speak.

Mr. Mouser then responded to the public questions and concerns. He stated that in regard to the parking lot lighting, they are meeting the ordinance requirements. If there was an issue with the Chewy warehouse, they would look into it. It went through the same process and they used the same spec lighting.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if our photometric requirements comparable to those in the surrounding areas.

Mr. Mouser replied that they were almost identical. He stated that what they are doing on these industrial buildings is considerably less than a commercial property. He moved onto the next item of screening from the parking lot on the west end. There is a whole row of shrubs to screen the parking lot. They are meeting the ordinance on the screening. He stated that they are extending the road but it will not connect to County Road 1000. They have stopped short by 100 feet and it will not connect until the improvements to the road are made. All traffic will enter on Innovation Boulevard. He stated that it is not feasible from their end to move the parking to the other end. Each corner is a glass front entrance which are intended to be the office area. The parking lot on the west end is intended to be the parking for that entrance. It would depend on the tenants and how they would utilize the space. The drainage run off concerns were then addressed. He stated that it was curb and gutter section. It is caught in a pipe system and goes into the ponds. They will meet the ordinance requirements and are working with Mr. Gaston. He stated that they have received an email from the Clean Water Department and their erosion control plan was sufficient and should receive approval. He stated that there is no way to stop people from walking off site onto the homeowner's properties. They would probably not fence the outside due to possible future buildings. They are set back further than what the ordinance requires. They are currently double what the buffer yard requirements are at 60 feet. He stated the ditch is on their property. He stated that some of the trees may be dead. He then showed a different aerial showing the ditch and the tree line. He pointed out that they are adding the evergreens will add to the screening. He stated that the contours of the grading plan for the project have been on file. They opted not to do a traditional up and down mound. The road goes from the ditch up 4 feet. For them to put a mound in they would have to remove the existing trees and add the mound, then landscape it. They felt it was better to leave them there, give up the 30 feet, and add the additional evergreens.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any further questions for the petitioner.

Mr. Tim Whicker asked if the ditch would be considered a creek.

Mr. Gaston replied that it was an intermittent stream.

Mr. Tim Whicker asked where the ditch was in relation to the property line.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the plans show property line and the ditch is on the east side of it, then they have a 4-foot rise to their road. The tree line is straddling the property line. They are common trees.

Mr. Mouser stated that the ditch was 15 feet inside the property line. From their property line to the existing shrubs, that is the existing 45-foot buffer.

Mr. Tim Whicker asked what would typically be there in the means of a mound to meet the standards.

Mr. Brad Whicker added that the street is elevated roughly 4 feet above the current contours. He asked if the new evergreens were going to be planted on the new elevation of the street or at the existing elevation.

Mr. Mouser stated they would be planted on the slope about 2 feet lower than the road.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked what the planting height of those trees would be.

Mr. Mouser stated that the ordinance was 6 feet.

Mr. Dombrosky clarified the base requirements. It must be a 3-foot mound or they can substitute hedge plantings. They needed 4 points of landscaping per 100 feet. The mound is required but the drainage concerns usually override that. He stated that the mound is not the significant factor in the screening, it is more about the density of material and landscaping. They aren't showing that on the plans as they claimed the existing trees would meet or exceed that. Typically, they would show an existing tree inventory, with the number of trees, the species, and calipers. They opted not to do that in this case.

Mr. Tim Whicker asked if putting the mound within that 45 feet would create drainage problems due to the location of ditch.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that usually mounds do create more problems when you are squeezing it into an existing position versus putting it between your building and your road where you have more control to make it work. They usually cause more problems on offsite drainage than it helps with screening. The staff usually recommends increasing the landscaping standards in lieu of the mound.

Mr. O'Riley asked if increasing the landscaping would be more favorable.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that that is what they have generally done in the past.

Mr. Brad Whicker replied that he was sensitive to the voices heard here tonight, but that in his opinion he found that the parking lot and landscaping design acceptable. He would ask the petitioner that we find some level of compromise on providing some additional buffer, possibly a taller and tighter grouping of trees to provide more of a buffer to the landowners.

Mr. Mouser stated that they were willing to consider that and go with a 40-foot spacing instead of the 50-foot spacing for the evergreens. He also said they could go up to 8 feet in height instead of the 6 feet to compensate for the elevation change.

Mr. O'Riley asked what the diameter of the evergreens.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that they measure evergreens by height, not by caliper.

Mr. Palmer asked Mr. Gaston what was delaying the drainage board approval.

Mr. Gaston replied that there were several issues that needed revised, mainly final design issues. They would comply with their ordinances on a preliminary basis, but not a final. The drainage board does both preliminary and final approval at the same time.

June 11, 2019

Mr. Palmer stated that this one of the first cases that we have seen where it has been industrial hitting residential so closely. He asked if there was a hurry or with the amount of property owners affected, is there a way to get the parties together beforehand. He stated he cannot vote positively on a rash decision on the landscaping because he does not know what that would look like. He does not know if it appeases the concerns of the landowners. He thought they have a valid concern because of the hard line. He didn't know if because of the drainage board concerns if this could be continued and get the parties together.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that the drainage issues are typical at this stage. It is not justification for them to not to proceed.

Mr. O'Riley asked if they could come back with a better plan.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that the board members would need to give staff more specific guidelines to work with the petitioner to meet the expectations they may have and the concerns of the landowners.

Mr. Tim Whicker stated the issue of trying to build the berm downhill does cause an issue. With the slope, two feet would be taken up already so it's only one foot higher. Just because you cannot build a berm due to the slope doesn't mean you cannot move your building back 20 feet or cut your building off 20 feet. He understood that is not what anyone would want to do, but there are things that can be done to make some of that work.

Mr. Brad Whicker replied that we must think about the value of the berm now versus five years from now when its all filled in. He stated that asking them to shorten their building length to give additional screening is an extreme measure.

Mr. Mouser stated that they will meet the buffer yard if that's what it takes to get the approval tonight. They would do the survey and if they need to add additional trees in, they will but if not, they meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Brad Whicker asks Mr. Dombrosky to review the specifics for a primary and secondary to clarify for everyone. If they were willing to vote for primary approval tonight, what flexibility does that provide staff to work with the petitioner to work that out; or does it need to be clear.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that if they were going to adopt any modifications to the ordinances or reduction in standards, it must be done here tonight with a primary approval. We would not want to do that at a secondary approval nonpublic hearing. At the secondary, we are just going to review the plans to make sure they comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Steuerwald stated that he wanted to clarify for everyone and asked Mr. Mouser if what they are doing is withdrawing their request to waive the buffer requirements.

Mr. Mouser replied that if that is what it takes to get an approval and they want us to do that, but he cannot tell them what that's going to mean. It may mean that it's a mound and we clear trees out.

Mr. Palmer asked who owned the trees.

Mr. Mouser replied that they own the trees.

Mr. Palmer stated he thought there might be a question as to which side they were on.

June 11, 2019

Mr. Tim Whicker stated that it was farmland, so they probably farmed right up to the property line. The trees probably just grew right along the fence line.

Mr. Palmer stated that it concerns him voting on an approval tonight. He again stated he would hope to get the parties together to work it out productively. He has worked on many multi-million-dollar, multi-year projects throughout his career and believes that a month delay would not usually be a big economic driver.

Mr. Tim Whicker stated that he agreed that there is a workable solution and they seem to be willing to work on those.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated its not a reasonable step to put the parties together due to the amount of parties and their individual views. If we are not going to take a vote on this, then we need to give Mr. Mouser clear directions on what we need to see when he comes back.

Mr. Palmer replied that he agrees that it would be difficult to put that many together, but the public seems reasonable. He thought that we need to focus on the spirit and intent of the ordinance. He believed that this is an interesting case that presents some challenges.

Mr. Brad Whitaker stated that they are put in a precarious situation because they have said they will meet the ordinance, but we won't know what that looks like. He said that meeting the ordinance is probably inferior to what he is willing to do with the evergreens and taller trees.

Mr. Mouser stated that they were not trying to cut the trees down. They are willing to drop the request for waiver if it gets them approval tonight. They have someone moving dirt on July 1, 2019 and the building being looked at by a potential tenant, so they did not want to delay.

Mr. Ayres stated that as Mr. Tim Whicker had mentioned, the tree line is probably at or very close to the property line due to the farmland. He thought that unless the surveyed property lines are extremely off, that they would have room to leave the existing trees and still do something in addition to that on their side. There are other alternatives they could take, even if that means shifting the drive over so the space is not so compacted. He found it hard to believe that they couldn't meet the landscaping and buffer requirements and leave those trees in for added insurance.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they have shown a willingness to work to meet the ordinance. He thought that meeting the letter of the ordinance was going to mean some reductions. He thought they can do a better plan with some minor modifications and come back next month.

Mr. Palmer stated that there were a couple of other significant variances they were requesting.

Mr. Brad Whicker replied that if there were other items that the board needs to address then they need to be crystal clear with their direction.

Mr. O'Riley asked why the road is 4 feet higher.

Mr. Mouser replied that it was all tied to grade.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that he believed that the solution lies in the density and the height of the trees.

Mr. Mouser stated they are willing to do the survey and meet the density.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any other modifications or issues that needed addressed.

Mr. Palmer stated that what he heard was border/buffer yard that was brought up by many tonight. There was a drainage concern, which he assumed would be handled with the drainage board. The roof screening was brought up. It was interesting to him that the reference point was 4 feet off the ground. He didn't know if that was a good reference. There was a claim that the brush and trees are on the property owners' side. Traffic was also a concern, but he thought Mr. Ayres had a handle on that.

Mr. Ayres replied that nothing was finalized, but they are looking closely at how this will affect traffic and roads when the project comes down to County Road 1000 and State Road 39.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that for clarity, he was asking for any other modifications from the petitioner that needed addressed. What he brought up were concerns from the landowners.

Mr. Palmer replied that he had misinterpreted his question and apologized.

Mr. Brad Whicker reviewed the modifications:

1. Bicycle parking; he stated he would hope that they would add additional spaces if the employees are bicycling to work. He understood that would depend on the tenant.
2. Parking lot perimeter landscaping to the north; he understood and that it made sense to not do if there was going to be a building there in the future.
3. Parking lot perimeter landscaping to the south; the trees and mound are not within 30 feet of the parking lot. He stated staff does not have an issue with that.
4. Buffer yard 3 required on the west side; he stated that this is the one most discussed this evening.
5. Waste containers; he understood that without knowing the user, this is a normal request.
6. Offsets/projections, masonry and color variations; he stated that these are all common requests with industrial buildings. He believed that the ordinances should be looked at and changed for these industrial buildings.
7. Roof mounted equipment; he stated that the intent of the ordinance is to screen from passersby, mainly the vehicles on Innovation Boulevard and State Road 39. This would be the first time we've had the request from a residential standpoint.

Mr. Paul Myer stated that the sight lines are from their property lines up to the top of the buildings. He noted that the all the corners have a 4-foot raised parapet. If the units could be placed in the corners, then there would be additional screening. There would only be rooftop units if the tenant wanted to air condition the warehouse. It would ultimately depend on the user.

Mr. Palmer asked how we would make sure there is good screening since it is going from industrial to residential. Could we make it tangible somehow?

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that his suggestion would be that the petitioner work directly with the staff and that staff speak with the landowners to address the concerns.

Mr. O'Riley asked if it would be good to continue it and give the landowners time to reach out to staff to work this out. He noted that he understood they don't want to delay, but he thought it was in the best interest to do so.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that staff would welcome public concerns. The notices were sent out and put in the paper. Staff wanted to hear from them.

June 11, 2019

Mr. Steuerwald stated that if they are not requesting a waiver and they are meeting the ordinance then we have a ministerial function.

Mr. Palmer stated that he didn't think they were withdrawing the whole waiver.

Mr. Mouser stated that he was withdrawing the waiver for the modification on the buffer yard on the west side only.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that they would need all four members vote tonight to get the approval and he did not think we would get there.

Mr. Palmer motioned to continue **DPR 475/19: I-70 West, LLC / Bldg. 3** to the July 9, 2019 meeting.

Mr. O'Riley seconded the motion.

FOR – 4 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

Mr. Brad Whicker noted that he was not in favor of the continuance, but for the sake of progress he voted for it. He stated that there would be no public hearing next month. Tonight, was the public hearing.

Mr. Brad Whicker closed the public hearing.

WISHES TO BE HEARD

Mr. David Weyant, 7721 Shagbark Court, Brownsburg appeared. He is the owner and editor of the Brownsburg Sentinel and had come tonight to cover the ZA 464/19: Redwood Acquisitions petition. He stated that he would like to see improvement on the notification to the public of petitions that are continued or removed from the agendas. He thanked the members for the way the handled the public's concern and truly listened. He also was appreciative of our use of Beacon and the posting of the information on the petitions on the county website for review beforehand.

Ms. Rachele Baker appeared again. She wanted to note that a previous aerial photo that was shown during the petition, after the public's comments, was taken before the Ash trees had died.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that we had a new appointment for the commission seat from North Salem, Mr. Ron Kneeland. Next month the board would need to appoint someone to the Board of Zoning Appeals as well as the Administrative and Plat Committee, when all seven members were present.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

---

Tim Dombrosky, Chairman